IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5038 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

AJABSINH ALIAS JEBU KIRPALSINH ATHAWAL PANJABI

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 5038 of 2001

MR ANIL S DAVE for Petitioner No. 1

MR SS PATEL AGP for Respondents No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 24/12/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The petitioner has been detained under the provisions of Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as `the Act of 1985') by the order dated 20/6/2001 passed by the

Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad City and he has been declared as bootlegger.

2. It is now well settled that unless the activities of a person as bootlegger has disturbed the maintenance of public order, he cannot be detained under the Act. Reliance is placed on a decision in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta Vs. Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad & Ors. reported in AIR 1989 SC 491.

3. I have heard learned advocate for the petitioner and also perused the material on record. According to learned advocate for the petitioner, the detaining authority has passed the detention order relying upon four offences registered against the petitioner - detenu under the Bombay Prohibition Act and also relying upon the statement of witnesses recorded by the detaining authority. Thereafter, the detenu made a detailed representation against the order of detention to the concerned authority on 29/6/2001 and thereby demanded copies of certain documents like statements of CN Rajput, Jitendra Natvarlal, Takhatsinh, Prakashsinh, Jitendrasinh, ASI Officer, Patil Prakashbhai Hirabhai, Bharatsinh Somabhai, Hiraji, Juvansinh, Ranjitsinh, Vinodkumar Mafabhai, ASI, Harthuji Hethuji, Rejendrakumar Udesinh etc. The concerned authority has received the said representation on 30/6/2001 copy of acknowledgment receipt of the Postal Department is produced on page 115 of the compilation. The detaining authority vide letter dtd.20/7/2001 provided some of the documents, but not provided the entire documents demanded by the detenu and thereby the detaining authority has prevented the petitioner from making an effective representation, as when the detaining authority has relied upon the said documents for the purpose of passing the order of detention against the detenu, it is the duty of the detaining authority to provide the entire documents to the petitioner. However, the detaining authority has failed to discharge his duty. Even no affidavit has been filed by the State authority. It has been held in a judgment delivered by this Court in the case of Ashokbhai Jivraj @ Jivabhai Solanki Vs. Police Commissioner, Surat and Ors. reported in 2000(1) G.L.H. 393 as under:

> "Before parting with the matter, we may observe that recently, we have come across few cases wherein no counter-affidavits are filed by the respondents. It is settled law that whenever an order of detention is challenged by a detenu or by his "next friend", it is the duty of the authorities to justify the action by filing

counter-affidavit preferably by the detaining authority himself, unless there are circumstances which may justify filing of affidavit by an officer or authority other than the detaining authority".

4. Since the material documents, relying on which the impugned detention order has been passed by the detaining authority, have not been supplied by the detaining authority to the petitioner though the specific demand has been made by the petitioner, nor affidavit has been filed either by the detaining authority or by the State authority explaining the action of the detaining authority for not providing the documents on which the detaining authority has relied upon while passing the impugned detention order, the petitioner is prevented from making an effective representation and hence the order of detention is illegal and the same cannot be sustained. Learned advocate for the petitioner does not press any other points.

5. The petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 20/6/2001 passed against the detenu is hereby quashed. The detenu namely Ajabsinh alias Jebu Kirpalsing Athwal (Punjabi) is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute with no order as to costs. Writ of this order be sent to District Jail, Junagadh instead of District Jail, Bharuch. D.S. Permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

Rafik